



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/784,892

02/24/2004

Bengt Lejdstrom

4010-38

9991

23117

7590

05/12/2009

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC  
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

SUBRAMANIAN, NARAYANSWAMY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3695

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/12/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/784,892	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LEJDSTROM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Narayanswamy Subramanian	<b>Art Unit</b> 3695	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to applicant's request for continued examination filed on February 18, 2009. Amendments to claims 1 and 3 have been entered. Rejections made under 35 USC § 112, first and second paragraphs in the last office action have been withdrawn in view of amendments and Applicant's persuasive arguments. Claims 1-3 are pending and have been examined. The rejections and response to arguments are stated below.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-3 recite the limitation "selecting a settlement rule to be followed in the clearing process, the rule defining how the transaction is to be settled". However the source of the settlement rule is not clear. Hence the scope of the claims is unclear. Also it is not clear which transaction the applicants are alluding to in this limitation because the preamble of the claims recites "financial transactions" and "a transaction". These claims also include the limitations "defining a settlement obligation group". It is not clear as to what is the relationship between the "settlement rule" that is selected and the "settlement obligation group" that is defined. Further it is not clear as to what is the relationship between the step of "locking in of the assets to which the transaction concerns" and the previous two steps of "selecting a settlement rule" and "defining a settlement obligation group". These claims also recite the limitation "selecting

Art Unit: 3695

transfer instructions for all settlement obligations belonging to said settlement obligation group”. However the source of the transfer instructions is not clear. Hence the scope of the claims is unclear. Finally, these claims also recite the limitation “reporting the result of the settlement to the participants involved”. This limitation lacks antecedent basis because “participants involved” have not been defined in any of the preceding steps.

Claim 2 recites the limitation “the function for the clearing process being arranged to prepare transactions for the settlement process”. The metes and bounds of the limitations “preparing a transaction” or “to prepare” are not clear.

The claim limitations in claim 3 use the phrase “means for” or “step for”, but they are modified by some structure, material, or acts recited in the claims. It is unclear whether the recited structure, material, or acts are sufficient for performing the claimed function which would preclude application of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. For instance in claim 3 in the limitations, “means for selecting a settlement rule to be followed in the clearing process, the rule defining how the transaction is to be settled”, “means for locking in of the assets to which the transaction concerns, the locking- in having the effect of reserving said assets for a specific settlement” and “means for selecting transfer instructions for all settlement obligations belonging to said settlement obligation group, said transfer instructions being irrevocable instructions to transfer the locked-in assets between participants in the CSD” the phrase “means for” is modified by sufficient structure, material or acts for achieving the specified function.

If applicant wishes to have the claim limitation treated under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, applicant is required to amend the claim so that the phrase “means for” or “step for” is clearly **not** modified by sufficient structure, material, or acts for performing the claimed

Art Unit: 3695

function. If applicant does **not** wish to have the claim limitation treated under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, applicant is required to amend the claim so that it will clearly not be a means (or step) plus function limitation (e.g., deleting the phrase “means for” or “step for”).

The rejections given below are interpreted in light of these 112, second paragraph rejections.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory Subject matter.

35 USC 101 requires that in order to be patentable the invention must be a “**new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof**” (emphasis added).

The steps of the method, for carrying out financial transactions within a Central Securities Depository (CSD) are untied to another category of statutory subject matter and hence the claimed method of the invention does not qualify as a process under 35 U.S.C 101.

Claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method comprising the steps of selecting a settlement rule, defining a settlement obligation group, locking in of the assets to which the transaction concerns, selecting transfer instructions, checking that said transfer instructions are carried out successfully, and reporting the result. Although the preamble of the claim recites a computer-implemented method, there is no explicit recitation of a computer in the body of the claim. Based

Art Unit: 3695

on Supreme Court precedent, a proper process must be tied to another statutory class or transform underlying subject matter to a different state or thing (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)). Since neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not considered a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. 101. To qualify as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplished the method steps or positively reciting the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state. Merely reciting an “automated, computer-implemented method” in the preamble is not sufficient to overcome this rejection. The steps of the claim must positively recite the computer in the body of the claim.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure are listed on the attached form PTO-892.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Narayanswamy Subramanian whose telephone number is (571) 272-6751. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 8:30 AM to 7:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Art Unit: 3695

Charles R. Kyle can be reached at (571) 272-6746. The fax number for Formal or Official faxes and Draft to the Patent Office is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PMR only. For more information about the PMR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Narayanswamy Subramanian/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3695

May 4, 2009